No. 20. VOL. IV.

The Balance, AND COLUMBIAN REPOSITORY.

"HAIL SACRED POLITY, BY FREEDOM REAR'D!
"HAIL SACRED FREEDOM, WHEN BY LAW RESTRAIN'D!"
BEATTIE.

HUDSON, (NEW-YORK) TUESDAY, MAY 14, 1805.

Editorial.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS.

ON no ſubject have the democrats diſcovered more inconſiſtency, hypocriſy, ſhuffling, canting, quibbling, evaſion, cheating, falſhood and deceit, than on the freedom of the Preſs. Their practice has always been directly at variance with their profeſſions; and both practice and profeſſions have changed as often as new caſes have come before the public. At one time they will tell you that it is all right to puniſh a printer for publiſhing *truth*—at another, they will inſiſt upon the right of publiſhing with impunity, *falſe, ſcandalous* and *malicious* libels againſt the government. At one time, the preſs ſhould be licentious leſt it ſhould not be free—at another, it ſhould not be free, leſt it ſhould become licentious. One day, the freedom of the preſs means one thing—the next, it means ſomething elſe—the next, ſomething elſe—the next, ſomething different ſtill—and ſo on, through ſo many turnings and twiſtings, and windings, that the ableſt lexicographer in the world could not define it according to democratic notions.

This inconſiſtency and contradiction can be very readily explained. The democrats have never been willing to declare, in plain terms, their *real* ſentiments concerning the preſs. Amongſt all their definitions and profeſſions, their opinions have not been truly given. Hence has ariſen a jarring and claſhing, which the moſt artful of their tribe cannot reconcile. Thoſe who tell *nothing but the truth* never contradict themſelves; but a liar is ſure to croſs and corner himſelf at every turn he takes—he gets bewildered and confuſed; and at length is loſt in the mazy labyrinth of his own crooked track.

The fact which the democrats have ſo long been endeavoring to conceal, has now come out. By their late conduct, they acknowledge that they wiſh the preſs to be ſo regulated, that *federaliſts* may be puniſhed for publiſhing the truth, while the democrats may publiſh what they pleaſe with impunity. For an elucidation of this fact, we beg leave to refer the reader to the following paſſage from a late electioneering addreſs, publiſhed in New-York. Had this been the production of ſome anonymous ſcribbler; or the mere rant of a ferocious Wortman—a *truth-telling* Cheetham—a ſhameleſs Holt—a hollow-hearted Mitchell, or a trimming Southwick, it would have claimed but little notice. It would have been thrown amongſt the democratic rubbiſh of the day and forgotten. But it comes in a formal addreſs, and ſanctioned by the name of Theodorus Bailey. This, however, ceaſes, in ſome meaſure, to ſurpriſe us, when we reflect that this is, in all probability, the ſame Theodorus Bailey, who once publiſhed a long liſt of the *ſavings* and *economies* of the preſent adminiſtration. The man who could *give* his name to *that*, we think need not feel any ſcruples of conſcience about *lending* it to *this*.

"We have already ſeen an Editor of a "public paper directed to be proſecuted "by a reſolution of both houſes, and ex-"preſsly prohibited from eſtabliſhing in "evidence the *truth* of the publication! "An attack thus bold and glaring upon "the principles of civil liberty, and the "rights of the people, demands a firm and "ſpirited reſiſtance. FREEDOM of the "PRESS ſhould be guarded with jealous "and vigilant ſolicitude. It is one of the "moſt invaluable of our political privile-"ges, becauſe it is eſſential to the preſer-"vation of every other. To inveſtigate "the conduct of public men, and the con-"ſequences of public meaſures—to ſpeak "and publiſh truth with freedom and in-"dependence—to reward the virtuous pat-"riot with the approbation of his country, "and to expoſe corrupt and deſigning in-"dividuals to the deteſtation which they "merit, are the inſeparable rights of every "freeman. If we are capable of ſurren-"dering thoſe rights, we are ripe for the "introduction of ſlavery in its moſt odi-"ous and terrific forms."

Cheetham is the editor referred to in the above-quoted paragraph. He was indeed "directed to be proſecuted by a reſolution of both houſes;" but was he "*expreſsly prohibited from eſtabliſhing in evidence the truth of the publication?*" Shame on the heart that dictated, and the hand that recorded ſuch a falſhood—a falſhood, that the journals themſelves contradict. A reſolution confining the privilege of giving the truth in evidence to Cheetham *alone*, was, it is true, rejected by the legiſlature; but a law was paſſed, allowing that privilege in *all* caſes; in which Cheetham's of courſe is included. How, then, can Theodorus Bailey muſter up impudence enough to ſay, that he was "expreſsly prohibited?" But even if Cheetham had been "expreſsly prohibited," or if no general law had paſſed, what reaſon would the democrats have had to complain?

The editor of this paper was once "expreſsly prohibited" from giving the truth in evidence on his trial for libelling the Preſident; and if we recollect right, all the Cheethams and Theodorus Baileys in the State, and United States, and, in ſhort, the whole democratic fry, from the higheſt to the loweſt, rejoiced and exulted, and approved the doctrine, ſo long as it affected none but federal editors. And now we ſhould like to know what entitles Cheetham to greater privileges than his brethren enjoy. "*Sauce for the gooſe, ſauce for the gander.*" The Legiſlature would have been perfectly juſtifiable in rejecting the reſolution in favor of Cheetham, even if no general law had been in contemplation. This would be a pretty land of liberty, indeed, if the Legiſlature was to abuſe its power, ſo far as to ſcreen a particular individual from penalties to which all others are ſubject. Yet this is the kind of liberty and equality that democrats contend for. Let the common law remain in force, ſay they, that federaliſts may be puniſhed for telling the truth: But when a democrat is proſecuted, let the Legiſlature paſs a ſpecial reſolution for his benefit.

The Struggle:

A CONSTITUTION OR NO CONSTITUTION?

FROM THE VERMONT JOURNAL.

MR. ELLIOT,

TO HIS CONSTITUENTS.

LETTER 3.

UNTIL after the deciſion in the House of Representatives, of the final queſtion upon the amendment to the Conſtitution, I had never contemplated the ſubject with a ſuitable degree of cool reflection and deep inveſtigation. Having always poſſeſſed a predilection for what is called the deſignating, or diſcriminating principle, I regarded the objections to it, on the ground of its being injurious to the ſmall ſtates, as the mere ſophiſtry, or at moſt the mere ingenuity of a party determined to oppoſe every meaſure of the majority. Much patient examination of the ſubject, at a later period, has convinced me that my firſt impreſſions were erroneous; and has at the ſame time, produced in my mind a perfect conviction of the propriety of that remark, that he who never changed his opinions, never corrected his miſtakes.

Were I again to deliver my ſentiments upon the amendment; I ſhould urge the following objections to its adoption. In an abſtract view of the ſubject, inſtead of rendering the conſtitution *more republican*, which is the profeſſed object of its advocates, it renders it leſs ſo: And it diminiſhes the influence and importance of the ſmall ſtates, relatively to the large ones.

By the conſtitution as it ſtood originally, the electors were to vote for two perſons as candidates for the office of Preſident and Vice Preſident, without any diſtinct deſignation of any particular candidate for either office. Let us here enquire, what has been the immediate cauſe of the ruin of all republics ancient and modern? the anſwer is obvious. The worſhip of popular idols, or, as the legiſlature of Delaware expreſſed the idea with equal felicity and dignity, "delirious devotion to individuals." What was the language of the conſtitution to the people in reference to the election of the chief magiſtrate? Neither yourſelvs nor the electors of Preſident ſhall have any idols. You ſhall vote for two men, either of whom ſhall be qualified for the Preſidency. Could any thing be more truly republican, more hoſtile even to the elements of ariſtocracy? But it has been ſaid that this was leaving the reſult of the election to the deciſion of chance. Let it be remembered that in the republics of Athens and Crete, and even in Rome, important magiſtrates were choſen by lot, and that the ſage legiſlators of antiquity conſidered that mode of election as the moſt democratic, and at the ſame time operating to exclude corruption and intrigue. Again we are told that it may be in the power of a few individuals to fruſtrate the will of the majority. Impoſſible. If the majority be not poſſeſſed of two characters equal to the duties of the Preſidency, it ought inſtantly to dwindle to a minority. Beſides, if the election of Preſident is always to be conſidered a mere party queſtion, parties will learn wiſdom from the circumſtances of 1801, and two candidates will not again receive an equal number of ſuffrages from any party. If that important election is to be diveſted of all party conſiderations, if another Waſhington is to unite all hearts, there can be no poſſible danger of an equality of votes. It has alſo been ſaid that the double ballot is favorable to intrigue, and it certainly appears ſo to a ſuperficial obſerver: but it is extremely queſtionable whether the general uncertainty of the reſult of the election does not render intrigue leſs probable than a mode of election, which enables the aſpiring demagogue to march directly towards the object of his ambition.

In forming the conſtitution, immenſe ſacrifices of weight and power were made by the ſmall ſtates, and none at all by the large ſtates. This important fact has never been attended to by the people. By the original principles of our confederation, as well as by the uniform practice of all ſimilar aſſociations, in ancient and modern times, the ſmall ſtates were entitled to equal political rights, of every poſſible deſcription, with the large ones, without reference to territory, wealth or population. The double ballot for Preſident ſeemed an important privilege to the ſmall ſtates. No poſſible combination of large ſtates could preclude the ſmall ones either from electing a Vice Preſident of their own, or deciding which of two candidates preſented by the large ſtates ſhould be the Preſident. This privilege is now abandoned, and five or ſix large ſtates may forever name both Preſident and Vice Preſident, and exclude the ſmall ſtates from any agency in the election. The relative weight of the ſmall ſtates is not only impaired as it reſpects the election by electors in the firſt inſtance, but it is leſſened in a ſtill more alarming degree when the election comes into the houſe of repreſentatives. The conſtitution provided that if no election ſhould be made by electors, the houſe of repreſentatives ſhould, voting by ſtates, from the five higheſt on the liſt of candidates elect a Preſident. It is certain that the narrower the range allowed the ſmall ſtates in the ſelection of the Preſident from the electoral candidates, the ſmaller the degree of their weight in the election. They are now reſtricted to the three higheſt candidates. It is calculable then with mathematical certainty, that they have made the enormous ſacrifices of two fifths of their weight in the election. This cannot be denied. As well might it be aſſerted that two and two do not make four, or that the ſun does not ſhine at noon day.

The alarming event which occurred at the firſt election of Mr. Jefferſon, when, in conſequence of an equal number of votes between him and Mr. Burr, and the pertinacious adherence of the federal party in the houſe of repreſentatives to the latter gentleman, the election was ſuſpended for ſome days, has been repreſented as imperiouſly demanding the alteration of the conſtitution, and unqueſtionably tending to make that alteration very popular—That event, however, inſtead of diſplaying the weakneſs, proved the ſtrength of the conſtitution. The members of the houſe of repreſentatives had then an awful reſponſibility reſting upon them, the reſponſibility which would have reſulted from leaving the union without a preſident, and probably without a conſtitution, had no election been made by the 4th of March. From that reſponſibility they are releaſed by that part of the late amendment, ſo peculiarly objectionable to myſelf and others, which authorizes them to make no choice, and to devolve the preſidency for four years upon the vice-preſident. Nor is it probable, although it is indeed poſſible, that an equality of votes between two candidates would occur again in an age; and it is as probable that it may occur now as it was before the alteration; notwithſtanding the diſcrimination, two candidates may have an equal number of votes, and a future congreſs may divide between them with as much obſtinacy as did the former one. Again, it has been ſaid that the alteration was neceſſary to ſecure the re-election of Mr Jefferſon. Has republicaniſm ſo rapidly degenerated in our country, that already the conſtitution muſt be altered with a view to the promotion, emolument or continuance in office of an individual, however eminent for his talents or patriotiſm? But the reverſe of the aſſertion was the fact. With, or without the alteration, the re-election of Mr. Jefferſon, in all human probability, was equally certain. Witneſs the committee appointed by a caucus, of the majority of the members of both houſes, to deviſe ways and means to direct the electoral votes in ſuch manner as to produce the re-election of the Preſident, ſhould the amendment not be adopted.

But other alterations of the conſtitution, ſtill more deſtructive of the rights of the ſmall ſtates, were in contemplation; and of the creation of an ariſtocracy of large ſtates to be guided and governed by Virginia, the amendment in queſtion was conſidered as the harbinger. The evidence to ſupport this aſſertion, and the character of the intended inovations will form the ſubject of a future letter. Equally in a ſingle community and in a confederated republic, there is a natural effort to make the ſtrong ſtronger, and the weak weaker. I ſhall drop my pen for the preſent when it has recorded the remark, that I have never intentionally given a vote calculated to reduce the weight of the ſmall ſtate of Vermont in the American Union, and the promiſe that I never will give ſuch a vote in future.

JAMES ELLIOT.

FROM THE UNITED STATES' GAZETTE.

A writer in the Aurora, endeavoring to perſuade the people to abandon Governor M'Kean at the next election, uſes the following expreſſions:—"The outrages of the bench and the bar *(approved by the Governor)* have been ſuch, that not to attempt their deſtruction, would be to ſuffer our pockets to be picked without arreſting the THIEF, although expoſed to our view." A pleaſant account this, of the character of the democratic Governor whoſe friends boaſted that he was elected by a majority of thirty thouſand votes.

FROM THE CHARLESTON COURIER.

Ca Ira, Ca Ira.

ECONOMIES—MORE ECONOMIES.

THIS DAY at 12 o'clock, the United States, Revenue Cutter will be ſold *at auction, for notes payable at ſhort dates.* Any perſon wanting a ſnug little ſloop

well calculated for the Coaſting or Weſt-India trade, may get a great bargain for good paper. As the Virginians, immediately after poſſeſſing themſelves of the government, ſold a number of frigates, ſloops of war and gallies, with public ſtores of all kinds, at fifty per cent. below their value, the little Cutter will doubtleſs be knocked off cheap. Some time ſince the Revenue Cutter brig the *General Pinckney* (perhaps the name was obnoxious to Monſieur GALLATIN) was ſold. This was deemed a mighty ſtrange procedure. Although depending for all our revenue upon trade, yet the very ſhreds and patches which remained of the proteſtion given to it in paſt times were gathered up, and ſent to vendue to raiſe *a little caſh*.

When the commerce of the country was filling the Treaſury it received, nothing from the government. With an extenſive coaſt, full of inlets, and a trade with all the world, in which people of all nations participate, it ſeemed to our cabinet that the honor and the honeſty of our traders were to be a ſufficient ſecurity againſt ſmuggling, and our Cuſtom-Houſe was to be left without even a cutter. Some of the democrats however thought this was carrying the matter too far; they allowed it to be wrong; and their maſters promiſed another in lieu of the General Pinckney, which was then ſaid to have been *inconveniently large*. A ſmaller veſſel was got, but as the Preſidential electi a has gone by, and all is ſtill ſafe, it ſeems to raiſe the wind, the *United, States' Cutter* will this day be ſold.

Editor's Closet.

Amongſt the many proofs of democratic attachment to WASHINGTON, we find a few paſſages in MAT. CLAY's addreſs to his conſtituents, which we think have not been outdone by any body except Callender and Paine. Speaking of the government of the diſtrict of Columbia, Matthew calls it "a child of ariſtocracy—conceived in *ſin* and brought forth in *iniquity*;" and then he adds—

"I have converſed with no one member of congreſs upon this ſubject, but "ſays that the thing was wrong at firſt—"and yet ſome of them do ſay, that al-"though it was wrong, when firſt done, "yet we will not undo that wrong, be-"cauſe it was done by Gen. Waſhington, "and becauſe we (meaning the republi-"lican party) are accuſed with pulling "down, and undoing every thing he ſanc-"tioned. But my own opinion is, if it "was wrong then, it is wrong now "—and he that ſupports the wrong, be-"lieving it to be ſo, is as bad as he who "committed it—becauſe at firſt, it was a "mere matter of experiment, to ſay the "beſt of it—But in truth, I believe it was "to try how far the people would bear "the ſpirit of ariſtocracy—and after that, "monarchy."

This is indeed very candid in good Mr. Clay. I had much rather ſee ſuch plain dealing, than the canting hypocriſy of thoſe democrats who profeſs to revere the memory of Waſhington, whilſt they are laboring inceſſantly to tarniſh his fame. This man does not heſitate to ſay, that he believes Waſhington projected the federal city, for the purpoſe of opening the way to monarchy—that the project was conceived in ſin and brought forth in iniquity; and, finally, that the democrats who ſupport the wrong are *as bad as Waſhington!*

Democracy has changed its ground about as often in this country, as republicaniſm has in France, and in all their changes they have very cloſely reſembled each other. When, in France, it was blaſphemouſly declared that *the voice of the people is the voice of God*, it was inceſſantly repeated by our democrats here; and we heard of nothing but *pure democracy*, the *ſovereignty of the people*, the *infallibility of the people*, &c. &c. &c. But no ſooner does Buonaparte impoſe upon France a government ſo extremely deſpotic and arbitrary, that the people are ſtripped of every political privilege, than out pop our *Protean* democrats, to emulate his example. Now they tell us that the people (or their immediate repreſentatives) are ſo extremely fallible that they are not fit to be truſted; and even that a deſpotic government (ſuch as Buonaparte's) would be preferable to a repreſentative one. A writer in Cheetham's paper, adopting this idea, ſays—

"The council of reviſion was intro-"duced as a ſafeguard to proteſt the citi-"zen againſt the haſte, the ignorance, the "intemperance, and, if caſes ſo extreme "could have been contemplated, the cor-"ruption of the Legiſlature."

Ariſtocracy! rank ariſtocracy! The council of reviſion is the ariſtocratic branch of our government; the greater part of its members hold their offices during good behaviour, and are in no wiſe dependent on the people. This ARISTOCRATIC branch, then, according to this writer, "is to proteſt the citizen againſt the *haſte*, the *ignorance*, the *intemperance*, and the *corruption* of the DEMOCRATIC branch—the legiſlature." That is, to proteſt the people againſt their worſt enemies, themſelves!

A BAD MEMORY.

"One charge againſt Mr. Jefferſon, a-"bout which the oppoſition prate unceaſ-"ingly, is that he has diſplaced many fed-"eral officers and appointed republicans in "their ſtead; and this too, they aſſert, for "*no other reaſon* than that the former differ-"ed from him in their political principles. "We wiſh to know what other reaſon is "neceſſary?"

[*Political Obſervatory.*]

Reader, the above ſentence appears in a paper edited by the Rev. Stanley Griſwold—the ſame man who, in a ſermon which he preached at Wallingford, Conn. on the famous democratic thankſgiving, declared, that "if Mr. Jefferſon ſhould proceed to remove men from office, merely on account of their political opinions, he would be the firſt to condemn him"—or words to that effect. O, ſhame, where is thy bluſh!

A New-Hampſhire demotrat, not long ſince, was reviling the federaliſts; and according to the cant of his party, charged, the officers of the former adminiſtration with being *Old Tories*, *Ariſtocrats*, &c. not excepting Mr. Adams. A bye-ſtander aſked him if he meant Samuel Adams? No, ſaid the Colonel, I mean John Adams—Samuel Adams, and John Hancock, were not TORIES; they were true LIBERTINES.

THE LAWS.

It will be recollected that our Legiſlature, at the laſt ſeſſion, gave three or four ſtarveling printers the job of printing the laws of the State. This, in all probability, was done with no other view than to help thoſe printers to a temporary exiſterce; for their papers, we believe, circulate in ſuch narrow limits, that they can hardly be ſaid to make the laws generally public. But we do not mean to complain. Since democratic preſſes muſt be ſupported, we muſt all contribute our mite without murmuring. Believing, however, that ſome of our readers are deſirous of ſeeing the laws, without being compelled to take democratic papers, we this day commence the publication of them in the Balance—*without money and without price.*

Laws of New-York.

AN ACT,

To amend an Act, entitled "An Act for the more speedy recovery of debts to the value of twenty-five dollars."—Passed the 9th of April, 1805.

Be it enacted by the People of the State of New-York, represented in Senate and Assembly, That from and after the passing of this act, in all cases where a judgment shall be rendered against any person, and an execution issued by virtue of the above recited act, the execution so issued shall direct that the amount of the judgment so rendered with the taxable costs, shall be levied on the goods and chattels of the person against whom such judgment was rendered: And for want of goods and chattels whereon to levy, the execution shall direct the constable to take the body of the person against whom such execution was issued, and convey such person to the keeper of the common gaol of the proper county, there to remain till such judgment with all taxable costs shall be fully paid, any law to the contrary notwithstanding: *Provided always,* That if the person against whom such judgment shall be rendered, shall prove to the satisfaction of the justice at the trial on which such judgment was rendered, that such person was not a freeholder, and had a family within this State, then the said justice shall endorse the same on the back of the execution at the time it is issued; and the person against whom it is issued shall not be imprisoned by such execution, upon condition that such person will pay the said judgment & costs unto the constable in whose hands the execution is, by instalments, one dollar and fifty cents within one month after the judgment is given, if so much is due, and one dollar and fifty cents each and every month thereafter till the whole judgment and costs are fully paid; but upon the neglect or refusal to pay such instalment or instalments as may at any time be due or unpaid on such execution, the person against whom it is issued shall be imprisoned till such instalment or instalments are fully paid: *Provided also,* That the benefit of the above provision shall not extend to any defendant in an action of trespass, in which the justice before whom such action shall be brought shall judge the said trespass to be wilful or malicious: *Provided also,* That in all cases where there shall be more than one execution issued against one and the same person entitled to pay by instalments, the execution first delivered to the constable, shall have the preference, and the person against whom it was issued, shall not be compelled to answer to any other execution until the execution first delivered is paid: *Provided also,* That nothing in this act contained shall be construed to prevent the constable in whose hands any execution may be, from levying the same on the goods and chattles of the person against whom it was issued whenever they can be found, any thing in this act or the act hereby amended to the contrary notwithstanding.

And be it further enacted, That it shall be the duty of every constable who shall receive an execution against any person, to endorse on such execution the time he received the same in order that it may be determined which execution has the preference, as directed by this act.

And be it further enacted, That every person who shall bring a certiorari to reverse any judgment rendered in pursuance of the act hereby amended, shall deliver to the justice who gave the judgment, at the time he so serves the certiorari, a copy of the affidavit upon which the copy of the certiorari was obtained, and it shall be the duty of the justice when he makes his return to the writ, to return specially as to the facts set forth in the affidavit, and annex the copy of the affidavit on which the certiorari was obtained, to his return.

And be it further enacted, That it shall and may be lawful for executors and administrators to prosecute and recover all debts due to their testators or intestates, of the value of twenty-five dollars or under, by virtue of the act hereby amended.

And be it further enacted, That the words "city or" in the second line of the sixth section of the act hereby amended, shall be and are hereby repealed.

And be it further enacted, That all attornies and other officers of any court, except during the sittings thereof, may be proceeded against under the said act hereby amended as other citizens, any law, usage or custom to the contrary notwithstanding.

And be it further enacted, That the party claiming exemption from imprisonment agreeable to the fourteenth section of the act hereby amended shall not be entitled thereto unless such party shall prove on the trial to the satisfaction of the justice, that he is entitled thereto, any thing in the said hereby amended act to the contrary notwithstanding.

Monitorial.

To aid the cause of virtue and religion.

EXTRACT.

Tunc fallere solers
Apposita intortos extendit regula mores. PERSIUS.

THE education of children is one of the most important duties of human life—I mean so far as it relates to their moral conduct. It was, in a great degree, from the system of morals established by Lycurgus, and persevered in by the Spartans, that the Lacedæmonian commonwealth maintained its independence, amidst the wars and commotions which surrounded it, for five hundred years. Plutarch attributes the turbulent and seditious state of the Romans, in the early ages of the republic, to the want of a system of education, which Numa neglected to introduce among his regulations for the government of the state. But when the Romans arrived at a very great degree of consequence and power, they paid proper attention to the morals and education of youth. The most eminent women employed themselves in forming the manners and minds of young children. It is said that Cornelia, Aurelia and Attia, mothers of the Gracchi, Julius Cæsar and Augustus, were governesses to the children of noblemen. To this system may be attributed the rise of those great and brilliant characters who brought the republic to its full growth and maturity. Some of the most wealthy nobles kept grammarians in their houses, for the purpose of instructing their children—but generally the Roman youth were sent to the grammar schools, to qualify them for the Forum. Tully reports that the Gracchi were educated *non tam in Gremio, quam in sermone Matris*—and that C. Curio, who was considered as the third orator of his time, received only a private education. The author of the Dialogue *de Oratoribus* (either Quinctilian or Tacitus) ascribes the great corruption of manners, which broke out among the Romans in after times, to the neglect of parents in regard to the morals and education of children, which were then commonly committed to the care of a Grecian female slave, and one or two male domestics—in like manner as people in the West-Indies, and some of the southern states, commit their children to the care of negroes. Q.

Miscellany.

FOR THE BALANCE.

Mr. Editor,

I AM one of those called Federalists, and would do almost any thing to "cherish the interest of [our] party."—Some conversation with a democrat the other day, who has been repeatedly to Albany the winter past, gave me *one* new idea of government. He asserted that there were but nine federal members of assembly the last session, and that they ruled the house so entirely, as to carry into effect every measure they brought forward; and that *the whole* of it was done by Bribery!

Now as I had never heard of a more respectable democratic Governor, Council & Legislature, & having been informed these same federal *measures* have passed the council of revision and consequently become laws of the State—Thinks I, if an uniform system of Bribery were to be formed under proper regulations, it would have a fine effect. Tho' I am not much of an arithmetician, I like to turn my penny to advantage as well as the best of them; and let us see if it would not be both the cheapest and surest way to support federal measures, to copy the example of the Noble Nine. If I mistake not, this method would at once rid us of annual contributions, time and travelling expences for electioneering purposes, and in all probability we might in a short time be freed from the trouble of attending elections.

PROJECTOR.

State Politics.

FROM THE (N. Y.) EVENING POST.

[CONTINUED FROM OUR LAST.]

WE now propose to finish the Purdy case. And as we have republished Judge Purdy's statement on one side, candour and fairness require we should republish the statements on the other side: we would certainly do so, were they not too long to be introduced at this time, amounting to about a column and an half.

German swears that in the early part of the session Purdy had three different conversations with him on the subject of the Merchants' Bank, all of them before the Bank petition was presented to the Senate. When it is recollected that Mr. German sat perfectly quiet in his place in the Senate

without making the leaſt diſcloſure during the paſſage of the bill through that branch of the Legiſlature, we think it cannot be of much moment what he may have ſworn afterwards, when the bill had got into the Aſſembly. Becauſe it was his duty if he acted conſcientiouſly and with the pure and ſingle intention of expoſing corruption and defeating its ſucceſs, to have made an immediate diſcloſure of all he knew. But when we preceive that after ſtating the attempts of Mr. Purdy to bribe, he finiſhes with this notable fact, that Mr. Purdy told him 'that he muſt nevertheleſs *act according to the dictates of his own judgment or conſcience* or both,' it may be allowed to produce ſomething like incredulity in the mind of almoſt any reader. The idea of a man's *corrupting* another to act according to *the dictates of his conſcience* certainly poſſeſſes the merit of novelty to recommend it, as to any thing elſe it is rather puzzling to one of ſo dull a comprehenſion as mine. Again; juſt before German cloſes his affidavit he ſays that Purdy "held out to the deponent that the *public good* ſhould be the *primary* conſideration with him in making up his opinion relative to the incorporation of the ſaid Bank." Here now is another method of corrupting a man: *corrupting* him to act from "a conſideration for the *public good!*" What a tremendous fellow at bribery this Purdy muſt be? It ſeems however, he very much miſtook his man. He applied himſelf to motives of the wrong ſort altogether. Inſtead of talking to his "Couſin German" 'of conſcience and public good,' and '*all that ſort o'thing*,' he ſhould merely have brought up the Chenango Court Houſe. There he would have touched him to the quick.—Purdy failed becauſe he did not know where the ſecret ſpring of his couſin's actions lay. To all the bribing applications of Purdy, it ſeems, our honeſt German who ſwelled ſo with conſcious integrity in the latter part of the ſeſſion, and whoſe honeſt pride roſe to ſuch an immenſe elevation, only ſaid, as he admits himſelf 'that he did not know whether he ſhould be againſt the bank or in favour of it, or whether he ſhould take neutral ground.' Now this from a man of high notions of honor, in reply to one who had repeatedly attempted his integrity was really ſuch an out-of-the-way ſort of behaviour as I much queſtion would have happened to no one on earth but Colonel German. 'Twas really ſuch a pretty ſimpering ſpecimen of inviting ſhyneſs, as would have done credit to the moſt finiſhed coquette in W——n ſtreet. O! moſt noble Colonel! But when he found that hints would not be taken, he then very plainly came out, and told Mr. Purdy that "he had certain objects in view and he muſt ſo conduct as to compriſe thoſe objects," and whether this was to be beſt accompliſhed by being *againſt* the Bank, or *for* the Bank, or by "taking neutral ground," he could not for the ſoul of him diſcover, till the bill had paſſed to the ſecond reading in the aſſembly.

Finally, it is to be obſerved, this deponent ſwears in one part of his long affidavit, that "the *laſt* particular converſation between Purdy and himſelf, was *a ſhort time before* the Bank petition was preſented to the Senate," but in the beginning of the ſame affidavit, he had ſworn that "the *Thurſday* before the Bank was made the order of the day in the aſſembly, (and of courſe many days, if not weeks *after* "the petition was preſented to the Senate,") the ſaid Ebenezer renewed his attempt to diſſuade the deponent from oppoſing the incorporation of the Bank." A man who has not memory enough to keep a ſingle affidavit together hardly deſerves credit when he ſpeaks of various facts a month old.

Such is the principal witneſs to deſtroy the character of Judge Purdy.

The other witneſs is a perſon who ſigns himſelf "Steph. Thorn," and whoſe depoſition appears on examination to be worth very little more than that of German. After ſtating Purdy's attempt to bribe him, he adds, as if by ſome ſtrange fatality he and German had agreed to deſtroy their own teſtimony, that Purdy "ſaid he wiſhed the deponent would vote for the ſaid Bank *if he could ſee it right*, and conveyed the idea that the incorporation would be a *public benefit*." This is quite akin to the idea broached by German. Thorn alſo ſays, "the converſations, were *before the bill was brought into the Senate*," and yet, he no more than German, ever made the leaſt attempt to arreſt its progreſs, there by any diſcloſure.

Laſtly, and to ſum up all, Mr. Thorn ſays "he conſidered at the time the proffer was made to him by the ſaid Ebenezer, as proceeding from an *error of the head*, rather than from *depravity of the heart*." This, it muſt be admitted, is extremely candid. A *corrupt* attempt to *corrupt* others proceeds from no depravity of the heart, but is ſimply a defect of the underſtanding. Now I take it, this is juſt ſuch a ſort of kindneſs towards Mr. Purdy that Mr. Jefferſon means when he promiſes to do the poor perſecuted federaliſts '*more* than juſtice.' From ſuch more than juſtice good Lord deliver us ſay I.

Having now diſpoſed of the teſtimony on both ſides, we are ready to return to the proceedings of the ſenate upon the whole matter.

After the report of the committee containing the evidence in ſupport of the charge and the evidence againſt it had been read the following reſolution was propoſed by Mr. Van Vechten.

"Whereas it appears to this Senate from the examinations of Stephen Thorn and Obadiah German, Eſquires, that Ebenezer Purdy, Eſq one of the Senate, has made overtures to them of an exceptionable and reprehenſible nature, to induce them, as members of the legiſlature, to advocate and favour the paſſage of the bill for incorporating the Merchants' Bank in the city of New-York, "by offers of ſhares in the ſtock of ſaid Bank, on terms which it was ſuggeſted would afford them a conſiderable gain." And whereas ſuch practices have an injurious and immoral tendency, and are calculated to ſhake the confidence of the Legiſlature. And whereas it alſo appears from the ſaid examinations, that the ſaid overtures were accompanied with ſuch explanations, and were received by the examinants in ſuch a manner as excite well-founded doubts whether the ſaid overtures were dictated by a corrupt intent, and eſpecially as one of the examinants depoſes that at the time he conſidered them as proceeding rather from an error of the head than from depravity of the heart; *and as neither of the examinants repelled the ſaid overtures with that diſguſt and indignation which corrupt advances would naturally have produced in correct and ingenuous minds, nor complained thereof, until the bill had paſſed the Senate, and until conſiderable heat had been excited in the Legiſlature on the queſtion of incorporating ſaid Bank;* and there is, therefore, no clear and ſatisfactory evidence before the Senate of vicious motives in the ſaid Ebenezer Purdy, to juſtify his expulſion from his ſeat. And whereas it is, notwithſtanding, incumbent on the Senate to bear unequivocal and deciſive teſtimony againſt all exceptionable and reprehenſible practices by any of its members... Therefore,

Reſolved, That this Senate deem it a public duty to cenſure, and do hereby cenſure the conduct of the ſaid Ebenezer Purdy, in making the overtures aforeſaid, as tending to impair the public confidence in that rectitude of character, which ought to be attached to every member of this houſe."

It would be a waſte of time, and too great a tax upon the patience of our readers, ſhould we give a detail of the great variety of ſhapes and colours aſſumed by Judge Tayler and his *aſſured* friends in the Senate, in order to get rid of this reſolution, or ſo much of it as delicately, but with great juſtice and force applies to Thorn and German.

The attorney General thought the beſt way would be to inſtitute a proſecution againſt the Judge, while Mr. Tredwell was for puniſhing him by expulſion from the Senate. This by the bye reminds me of the ſtory in Dilworth's ſpelling book, concerning the beſt way of fortifying a town. The Carpenter thought that Oak would afford the beſt defence; the Maſon was of opinion that ſtone was much better, but

the currier inſiſted upon it there was nothing like Leather. The mode propoſed by the Attorney General was rejected, 14 to 7. Tredwell's motion met with a ſimilar fate, 15 to 6, the attorney General voting with the majority, in the negative. In the affirmative we find his honor Judge Taylor, and let this be noted well. It will appear in ſequel however, that though this upright Judge was willing to expel Mr. Purdy, yet he was equally willing to allow him to remain, as ſhould be thought proper; to call him a wicked and corrupt man or an upright, honeſt Legiſlator, as your honors pleaſe, ſo that he only got German and Thorn out of the ſcrape.—I do not know whether I ſhall be credited, when I add that the Judge, after voting for the *expulſion* of Mr. Purdy on the expreſs ground that he was guilty of the charges brought againſt him, and had 'manifeſtly betrayed the truſt repoſed in him by his conſtituents,' made the following motion—

"Whereas it appears to this Senate, by the affidavits of Stephen Thorn and Obadiah German Eſqrs. that Ebenezer Purdy, Eſq. one of the members of the Senate, has made overtures to them of an exceptionable nature, to induce them as members of the Legiſlature, to advocate the Merchants' Bank in the city of New-York, by offers of ſhares in the ſtock of the ſaid Bank.

And whereas the facts as ſtated in the ſaid affidavits, do *not* convey that *clear* and *ſatisfactory evidence* before the Senate, of vicious motives in the ſaid Ebenezer Purdy, to juſtify his expulſion from his ſeat.

Therefore, Reſolved &c.

Now then let me aſk Judge Taylor, and as an editor of a public paper, diſcuſſing a public queſtion, I feel myſelf emboldened to demand it of him, to juſtify himſelf if he can, and to reconcile it with his conſcience, that he firſt voted to expel a Senator as being guilty of high crimes and miſdemeanors, and then got up and formally acknowledged in a written motion, to be entered on the Journals, that the affidavits produced againſt this Senator did not contain ſuch evidence of *vicious* motives as to juſtify expulſion? If there is a parallel for ſuch ſhameleſs inconſiſtency any where to be found within the records of any public body, I hope for the honor of human nature it may never be mentioned.

And here we cannot but take notice of ſome late unlucky flouriſhes of Mr. Editor Cheetham on this ſubject. In his paper of April 15, he has a number of papagraphs on the proceedings of the Senate—Among other things take the following—

"Mr. Van Vechten, Mr. Purdy's *aſſociate* in the previous ſenatorial conduct which led to this trial, aſhamed to acquit, and yet unwilling to expel, reſorted to a middle, but a novel courſe. He moved a reſolution of *cenſure* for the *bribery*, and Mr. Purdy was accordingly *cenſured!* The gentlemen of the Senate, who voted for the *expulſion*, voted againſt the reſolution of *cenſure*. Their conduct was correct and honorable.

"*Purdy again*—This *bribed & bribing* old man was either *innocent* or *guilty*; if innocent, he ought to have been acquitted, if guilty he ought to have been expelled. He was not acquitted, and therefore he was not innocent, and yet although not innocent, he was not expelled!

"*Again*—Purdy was *cenſured* by a reſolution of the Senate, Was he innocent? if yea, it were criminal to *cenſure* him."

If, gentle reader, you have ever delighted yourſelf with the peruſal of Moore's *Travels in Italy*, and have as good a memory as I have, you will recollect a humorous ſtory of *Harlequin and the Stutterer* in an opera at Venice. If you do, the above will inſtantly bring it to mind, for you will ſee Cheetham pitching his head directly into John Taylor's ſtomach. It may not, however, be amiſs juſt to add, that Mr. Cheetham has deviated from the truth in what he ſays about the votes in the Senate. He applauds thoſe gentleman of the Senate who voted for the *expulſion* becauſe they voted againſt the reſolution of *cenſure*. "Their conduct (ſays he) was correct and honorable." Unfortunately for him the fact was not ſo. The votes for *expulſion* ſtood thus—

For the negative—Meſſrs. Annin, *Brewſter*, Bruyn, Chipman, Danforth, Foote, Hogeboom, Hyde, Savage, Snell, *Thomas*, Van Schoonhoven, Van Vechten, Veeder, *Woodworth*—15.

For the affirmative—Meſſrs. *Denning*, Johnſon, Peck, Tallmadge, Taylor, Tredwell—6.

The votes for *cenſure* ſtood thus—

For the affirmative—Meſſrs. Annin, Bruyn, Chipman, Danforth, *Denning*, Foote, Hogeboom, Hyde, Savage, Snell, Van Schoonhoven, Van Vechten and Veeder.

For the negative—Meſſrs. *Brewſter*, Johnſon, Peck, Tallmadge and Taylor.

It is alſo a fact, as appears from the records, that Bruyn, and Woodworth, the Attorney General, who voted *againſt* the Bank, and Danforth, who was abſent when the queſtion was taken, all voted *againſt the expulſion*, and two of them *for the cenſure*; while Brewſter voted *againſt* both reſolutions and Denning *for* both. The Citizen is therefore every way unfortunate—unfortunate in his facts, & unfortunate in his panegyricks upon his "correct and honorable gentlemen."

Want of room obliges us now to cloſe the Purdy caſe without even the juſtice of a peroration. The tragi-comedy-farcical conclusion of the buſineſs is already, before the public. Every body before this time is poſſeſſed of the comical manner which the Judge *Taylor* in true ſtyle attempted to trim the *jacket*, and ſtick to the *ſkirts* of his brother Purdy; how he *laced* him aimed at his *fifth button*, hit him in the *bread baſket*, and had he not been prevented would doubtleſs ſoon have given him a ſecond edition of Broughton, made a caricature of his countenance, and let out his red ink. "O what a glorious thing's a battle."

Be it our weekly task,
To note the paſſing tidings of the times.

Hudſon, *May* 14.

HUDSON ACADEMY.

We congratulate our fellow-citizens on the proſpect of having *one* ſeminary of learning, within the corporation of Hudſon. A plan was ſtarted a ſhort time ſince, by a few public-ſpirited gentlemen, for erecting an Academy on the public ſquare, at the junction of the Union and Columbian Turnpikes; and we underſtand that it has been ſo generally approved, that a ſubſcription almoſt ſufficient for the purpoſe, has already been obtained; and that preparations are making for erecting and completing the building in the courſe of the enſuing ſummer. The property is to be held in ſhares at ten dollars each. A few ſhares remain to be taken up; and the books are open for ſignatures at the houſe of William Aſhley, Hudſon.

STATE ELECTION.

In Herkimer county, Meſſrs. WIDRIG, WRIGHT, and CORBIT, *moderate Republicans* are elected members of aſſembly in oppoſition to a ticket of violent democrats. The Herkimer paper ſays, the election was gained "by the aid of the federal party." We hope that federaliſts will ever be found ready to countenance and ſupport moderate and conſiſtent men of whatever party.

In Renſſelaer violence and democracy have prevailed, owing to want of proper attention and exertion.

In Dutcheſs——Ditto—Ditto.

The Eaſtern Diſtrict is entitled to three Senators. The Democrats run Quackenbuſh, Veeder, and Comſtock. The two latter were not oppoſed; but Mr. Joſeph C. Yates, *moderate republican*, run in oppoſition to Quackenbuſh and prevailed.

The celebrated Gen. Moreau, was at Cadiz, with his lady and family, on the 12th of March, waiting a good opportunity to come to New-York.

The French have demanded and received from the inhabitants of Lubeck, 200,000 marcs banco for the privilege of a free trade through Hanover. [*Ev. Poſt.*]

Extract of a letter from Cape-Francois, received at Philad. dated April 18.

"The Haytian army have returned without ſucceſs from the ſiege of St. Domingo; Gen. Chriſtophe is at preſent in town. They have brought with them a great quantity of plunder taken from the Spaniards."

Extract of another received, dated April 19.

"The Emperor has come into this city. His army is repulſed, owing to the arrival of the French fleet at the city of St. Domingo. The Americans, *their main ſtand by*, will in conſequence be more reſpected. They will now go to pealing coffee, and it is ſcarcely preſumable that the French can march from St. Domingo with 5,000 thouſand troops with ſucceſs."

Gun Boat, No. Blank, the day before yeſterday ſported her figure on the north river to the great diverſion of the ſpectators. The double bowſprit, the double head, or double tail, call it which you will, the long diſproportioned heavy figure and her dull ſailing, afford a firſt ſpecimen of Mr. Jefferſon's whirligig genius upon the water. It happened that a mill boat was paſſing the the ſtream in the ſame direction and though laden down to the water's edge ſhe paſſed Gun Boat, No. blank, with as much apparent eaſe to the diſtant ſpectators as if Miſs Gun Boat had been water logged or lay in her own proper ſtation, high and dry in a Savannah cornfield.—And if the experiment does not coſt the lives of every ſoul who is ſent out in her our fears will not be verified. [*N. Y. E. Poſt.*]

From our New-Orleans papers by the Hercules, which are to the 13th ult. we learn that a Duel took place there, on the 5th ult. between Lieut. Murray of the United States' Army, and Capt. Newcome of the Revenue Cutter, in which the former received a ball through the fleſhy part of his arm. We learn that the wound cannot create any ſerious injury.

[*Mercantile Advertiſer.*]

We have ſeen a letter from Bordeaux of the date of 4th March, which furniſhes the following intelligence of our affairs with Spain: It ſtates, "that Capt. Dutton of the U. States' navy, paſſed through that place, from Madeira, with diſpatches from Mr. Munroe to our Miniſter in Paris; that it was underſtood he had not ſucceeded in the object of his miſſion to the Court of Spain." [*Boſton Gazette.*]

BOSTON, MAY 3.

By Captain Farnham, who arrived yeſterday from Liverpool, we received London papers to March 19 incluſive. A paper of the lateſt date mentions the arrival of a Ruſſian Meſſenger, with diſpatches of great importance....The preparations for an important ſecret expedition were continued. The troops to be employed conſiſt of two ſquadrons of dragoons, and 14 regiments of infantry. The expedition is placed under the command of Gen. Craig and was conſidered on the point of ſailing. It was conjectured to be bound to South America.

A London paper of March 18, mentions the receipt of late Paris papers, and obſerves. "there is more talk on the continent of negociations than of campaigns."

FROM THE BALTIMORE AMERICAN.

The following letter received yeſterday, will ſhew that no argument of rigour can be drawn from holding Britiſh ſhips of war in our ports ſubject to the laws, it being enforced upon them in countries more feeble, and devoted to their government.

Extract of a letter received by the editors of the American, dated Liſbon, March 2, 1805.

A boat commanded by a lieutenant belonging to the Emerald Britiſh frigate, boarded ſeveral Britiſh veſſels and prizes under quarantine, on the evening of the 26th ult. and impreſſed 41 men out of them. The next day this government ordered the frigate into quarantine. In dropping down it appearing that ſhe was going below the place it was intended ſhe ſhould anchor, the caſtle fired four ſhot at her, and brought her to in much confuſion. Her boat then came on ſhore, and word was ſent by it that ſhe muſt not proceed to ſea till further orders. In the evening they attempted to drop her down oppoſite to the caſtle, at the ſame time ſending a boat on ſhore to aſk permiſſion, under a pretence of danger from a brig near her, but it was refuſed; and upon obſerving at the caſtle that ſhe was moving, a ſhot was fired which ſtruck her about the ſtern.—The anchor was immediately let go, and ſhe ſtill lies there, although ſhe is one of the ſhips of war that is to convoy the trade to England, and who all dropped down the 27th, and were to ſail on the 28th, but are now waiting for her. Much diſcuſſion has taken place, and it is underſtood that this government had ſome intention of demanding that the lieutenant ſhould be given up for puniſhment here; but the Captain of the frigate diſavowing any orders for the purpoſe, and returning the impreſſed men, it was finally compromiſed by putting the lieutenant under arreſt on board, and the Britiſh miniſter aſſuring this government that entire ſatisfaction ſhould be given it in England. The frigate is to ſail to-morrow with the convoy. About the ſame time three of the Algerine captives ran away from the arſenal and got on board a Britiſh frigate. Upon an appliation of this government the commander refuſed to give them up. But the Britiſh miniſter being informed that unleſs the demand was complied with, no deſerter from a Britiſh veſſel of war ſhould be returned or taken when on ſhore, the Algerines were forthwith reſtored.

"We are happy to learn (ſays the Boſton Gazette of the 6th inſt.) that the paſſengers and crew of the ſhip Jupiter, who had embarked on board the Long Boat, were fell in with by ſeveral fiſhing ſchooners, ſoon after they parted with the Yawl, and happily reſcued from their perilous ſituation. Mr. Gilbert J. F. Smiſſaert, one of the paſſengers, arrived in town yeſterday, from Marblehead, where he was brought by a veſſel, which received him from one of the fiſhing boats. He informs that the people preſerved with him, were all in health, and diſtributed among the ſeveral fiſhing veſſels on the banks."

ERRATUM.

In the Balance of laſt week, the number of votes in the town of Clermont, for William Tanner, was inadvertently ſtated to be 567, inſtead of 57.

The Knot.

MARRIED,

At Albany, by the Rev. Mr. Romeyn, ALEXANDER WILSON, Eſq. Attorney at Law, to Miſs MARY LIVINGSTON, daughter of the late Peter R. Livingston, Eſq. of the manor of Livingston.

At Kinderhook, (Saturday evening, May 7th) by the Rev. Mr. Judd, HENRY I. FREY, Eſq. Attorney at Law, of Palatine, in the county of Montgomery, to Miſs ELIZABETH VAN SCHAAIK, daughter of the Hon. Peter Van Schaaik, Eſq. of Kinderhook.

The Knell.

DIED,

At Vergennes, Hon. ENOCH WOODBRIDGE, late Chief Juſtice of the State of Vermont.

At Portſmouth, Hon. JOHN PICKERING, Eſq. L L. D. late District Judge of the District of N. Hampshire.

Wreath.

FOR THE BALANCE.

THE MILCH-BEAR.

IN days of yore, a good old grannam,
At fifty pounds, *old ten.** per annum,
Was hir'd to keep the village school;
To learn the girls to knit—the boys to read,
And teach the little children, all, the creed;
To say their pray'rs,
And such affairs,
And each to practise well the Golden Rule.

So well this pious woman play'd her part,
Each scholar got the catechism by heart:
The Bible, too,
(Though strange, 'tis true)
Was the sole book from which she taught 'em:
It was their chief delight
Some passage to recite,
And by such gentle means, to love her, bro't 'em.

One day, she call'd a pupil up to read,
Who, having found her place, did thus proceed—
The little maid
Was not afraid,
But boldly read from Gen'sis twenty-four;
And as she did rehearse
The forty-seventh verse,
She read these words—"*whom Milcah bore*—"

"Stop! stop!" the lady cried, in accents wild—
"You've read the passage wrong, I'm sure, my child;
"Pray, read that sentence o'er again."
At which the girl began to stare,
And stammer'd out—"*whom Milcah bare*—"
"Ay, ay," replied the mistress, "now 'tis plain—

"For they *might* MILK A BEAR—I knew't before,
"But 'tis *impossible* to MILK A BOAR."

PROTEUS.

* OLD TENOR—an antique currency—2*l.* 5*s.* equal to a dollar.

EXTRACT.

CAPTAIN [illegible]'S EXCUSE FOR NOT FIGHTING A DUEL.

WHAT! you're afraid, then?—yes, I am—
you're right;
I am afraid to sin but not to fight:
My country claims my service; but no law
Bids me in folly's cause my sword to draw.
I fear not Man, nor Devil; but, though odd,
I'm not ashamed to own, I *fear my GOD.*

Diversity.

DROVE OF BULLS.

DURING the time of a heavy shower, a gentleman on the banks of the Thames, seeing an angler sitting very composedly in a boat, without either hat or wig on, called out to him to know what sport he had, and why he exposed his bald head to the *pelting of the pitiless storm?* "Why faith, (replied the gentle swain) my hat is at the bottom of the boat, full of water, to put the fish in *when I have caught 'em;* and my wig I have put in my pocket, that it may not *wet my head*, and give me a cold: As to sport, I have had none yet, but, as I suppose the fish are all got under the arch of the bridge to keep themselves *dry* during this heavy shower, *as soon as it is over*, I will go and angle *there.*

THE Rev. Rowland Hill, when at college, was remarkable for the vivacity of his manners, and humor of his observations. In a conversation on the powers of the letter *H*, where it was contended that it was no letter, but a simple aspiration or breathing, Rowland took the opposite side of the question, and insisted on its being, to all intents and purposes, a *letter;* and concluded by observing that, if it were not, it was a very serious affair to him, as it would occasion his being *ill* all the days of his life.

In the villages of Holland, among the peasants, distance is computed by *smoking of their pipes;* and they tell you, that from village to village is about a *pipe and an half, two pipes, half a pipe, &c.*

[*Port Folio.*]

AGENTS FOR THE BALANCE.

NEW-YORK.

Kinderhook—D. Ludlow, P. M. *Albany*—Whiting, Backus & Whiting. *Utica*—M. Hitchcock, P. M. *Canandaigua*—Z. Seymour. *Manlius*—R. Wilson, P. M. *Whitestown*—R. Leavenworth, Esq. *Cherry-Valley*—Mr. Holt, P. M. *Cazenovia*—E. S. Jackson and the Post Master. *Aurelius*—Samuel Crosset, P. M. *Johnstown*—Nathan Brewster, P.M. *Onondaga*—G. W. Olmstead. *Cooperstown*—F. Stranahan, Esq. *Troy*—Wright, Wilbur & Stockwell. *Herkimer*—C. Woodruff. *Little Falls*—W. Alexander, P. M. *Geneva*—the Post Master. *Sharon*—Z. Pyneo, P. M. and J. Williams.—*Langingburgh*—G. Tracy, Printer. *Salem*—Dodd & Rumsey, Printers. *Marcellus*—Guy Humphrey, P. M. *Clinton*—J Simonds, P M. *Schenectady*—J. Shurtleff, P. M. *Sullivan*—E. Caulkins, P. M. *Paris*—H. M'Neil, P. M. *Pompey*—D. Wood, P. M. *Amsterdam*—Mr. Downs, P. M. *Niagara*—Lt. Geo. Armistead. *Tully*—J. Buel, P. M. *Cayuga*—H. Buckley, P. M. *Pittsfield*—C. Noble, P. M. *Brownville*—G. Camp. *Skencatelas*—Dr. Sam. Porter. *Saratoga*—A. Van Deusen, P. M. *Rhinebeck*—A. Potter, P. M. *Redbook*—M. Cantine, Esq. *Kingston*—David Burr & S. S. Freer. *Poughkeepsie*—R. S. Street, Esq. N. Power, Printer, and the Post Master. *New-York*—Michael Burnham, Publisher of the Evening Post. *Owego*—E. Dana, P. M. *Bath*—S. S. Haight and the Post Master. *Chenango Point*—C. Stone. *Walton*—W. Butler. *Unadilla*—O. Stevens. *Windham*—S. Hunt, P. M.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Stockbridge—H. Jones, P. M. *Springfield*—H. Brewer, Printer. *Pittsfield*—A. Strong, Esq. *Lanesborough*—M. Wells, P. M. *Williamstown*—Tryon & Callender. *Greenfield*—J. Denio, Printer, *Northampton*—S. Butler, P. M. *Randolph*—W. P. Whiting, P. M. *Worcester*—I. Thomas, Jun. *Boston*—J. Hastings, P. M. *Salem*—Mr. Dabney, P. M. and T. Cushing, Printer. *Nantucket*—J. Brock jun. *Plymouth*—W. Goodwin. *Leicester*—the Post Master. *Newburyport*—E. W. Allen, Printer, and J. Emerson, P. M.

CONNECTICUT.

New-Haven—Elias Beers. *Danbury*—E. R. White, P. M. and Mr. Gray, Printer. *Haddam*—the Post Master. *Farmington*—S. Richards, P. M. *Sharon*—G. King, jun, P. M.

NEW-HAMPSHIRE.

Hanover—J. Baldwin, P. M. *Boscawen*—Thomas W. Thompson. *Keene*—J. G. Bond, P. M. *Chesterfield*—E. Harvey, jun. P. M.

VERMONT.

Middlebury—Huntington & Fitch, Printers. *Newbury*—D. Johnson, P. M. *Royalton*—J Smith. *St. Albans*—E. W. Keyes, Esq. *Burlington*—G. Robinson. *Putney*—P. White, P. M. *Shaftsbury*—E. Niles, P. M. *Windsor*—N. Mower, Printer.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Athens—Mr Prentice, P. M. *Wilkesbarre*—T. Welles, and Mr. Miner, Printer. *Williamsport*—S. E. Grier, P. M. *Philadelphia*—W. Maris.

NEW-JERSEY.

Trenton—Sherman & Mershon, Printers, and the P. M. *New-Brunswick*—Mr. Blauvelt, Printer.

MARYLAND.

Baltimore—Yundt & Brown, Printers, *Easton*—Dr. R. Moore.

GEORGIA.

Augusta—D. Taylor. *Savannah*—A. Grant, and Seymour, Woolhopter & Stebbins.

OHIO.

Marietta—B. I. Gilman.

TERMS OF THE BALANCE,
FOR 1805.

To City Subscribers, Two Dollars and Fifty Cents, payable quarterly.

To those who receive them by mail, Two Dollars, payable in advance.

To those who take their papers at the office, in bundles, or otherwise, a deduction from the city price will be made.

A handsome Title Page and Table of Contents will accompany the last number of the volume.

NOTE.

The first, second and third Volumes of the Balance may be had on the following terms:—

First Volume—unbound— -	$ 2
Second Volume, - -	$ 2, 50
Third Volume, - - -	$ 2, 50
The three together, - -	$ 6

If bound, the price of binding (either plain or elegant) will be added.—An unbound volume may be sent to any post-office in the state for 52 cents postage; or to any post-office in the union for 78 cents

Advertisements inserted in a handsome and conspicuous manner, in the *Advertiser* which accompanies the Balance.

PUBLISHED BY
HARRY CROSWELL,
Warren-Street, *Hudson.*
WHERE PRINTING IN GENERAL IS EXECUTED WITH ELEGANCE AND ACCURACY.